[Sri M. A. Manickavelu] [22nd September 1956

The following relief measures have since been taken. The issue of takkavi loans has been accelerated by the appointment of a special staff of a Tahsildar and three Revenue Inspectors. A sum of Rs. 50,000 has so far been disbursed as Takkavi loans in the Kollegal taluk and the Collector has sanctioned a further allotment of Rs. 50,000 for granting loans :—

The concession granted by the Collector of Coimbatore by throwing open reserved forest for the free grazing and free cutting and removal of grass has been rendered ineffective by the lack of grass in the forest area due to want of rains. The Board Member, while on tour, had ordered the free cutting and removal of fodder leaves from the reserved forests. The Government have since directed that fodder be imported into Kollegal taluk from Yalandur in the Mysore State and distributed at concessional rates in the firka centres with State-aid and an advance of Rs. 1,000 under Agricultural Loans Act has been sanctioned for the purchase of hay.

Orders have been issued directing the Collector of Coimbatore to take up six works as low scale famine relief works in Kollegal taluk at an estimated cost of Rs. 28,000.

The Board of Revenue is taking action for the opening of six fair price shops to sell rice at subsidised rates, one at each of the six work spots. The Collector has taken suitable measures for the distribution of milk powder.

It is understood that there is no need for the opening of any gruel centres. As regards the other suggestion that the hon. Member made at the end of his speech, I would request him to give it in writing. I will have it examined.

III.—ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS *RE* MARCH OF TAMIL VOLUNTEERS FROM TIRUTTANI AND PUTTUR TO MADRAS TO OFFER SATYAGRAHA IN CONNECTION WITH THE BORDER DISPUTES.

MR. SPEAKER : I have received notice of two adjournment motions, one from Sri A. Govindaswami and the other from Sri A. Ratnam.

The hon. Member Sri Govindaswami is not in his seat and, therefore, his motion will be deemed withdrawn.

The next motion by Sri A. Ratnam reads as follows :—

'I beg to move a motion for the adjournment of the business of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., that the Government has failed in urging on the Central Government the formation of a Boundary Commission for the border disputes between Madras and Andhra States and the marching of 200 Tamil volunteers from Tiruttani and Puttur by foot to launch satyagraha before the Madras State Assembly on 24th September 1956.'

22nd September 1956] [Mr. Speaker]

This question of boundary disputes has come before this House for discussion in the shape of questions and resolutions, and this question was also discussed during the discussion on the motion of thanks to the Governor's Address. This question cannot therefore be now regarded as a matter of urgent public importance. The fact that 200 Tamil volunteers are going to March from Tiruttani and Puttur by foot to Madras can also not be the subject-matter of an adjournment motion. I, therefore disallow this motion under rule 41.

(Sri A. Ratnam rose.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Minister for Revenue will reply to the debate on the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Amendment) Bill, 1956.

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILL.

THE MADRAS CULTIVATING TENANTS PROTECTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956 (L.A. BILL NO. 10 OF 1956).

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: Sir, I carefully listened to the speech of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, and I found as usual in his speech heat and eloquence but not any convincing arguments supporting his case except vague and unfounded allegations about the *bona fides* of the Government. He said that the Government were marking time, that they were not earnest in bringing forward an all-compresensive reform, that they were tinkering with this question, that they wanted to postpone the real and important part of the reform, that they wanted to please and satisfy the landholders, and so on. Now I shall explain the position. The House will then know what the Government have been doing and whether there is any basis for the charge that the Government are not earnest in their attempts to bring forward land reforms. The Government were anxious to bring forward this land reform and they were also particular to bring in an all-embracing legislation consisting of provisions for the fixation of fair rent, imposition of a ceiling on holdings, and a limit regarding the acreage under personal cultivation, and also a provision for enabling the tenants or the cultivators to get proprietary rights, that is, to become owners of the land. Therefore the Cabinet Sub-Committee sat for a number of days and prepared a scheme which embraces all these factors. They were about to introduce the Bill and pass the legislation. But, unfortunately, Sir, they came across certain constitutional and legal difficulties. So, that scheme as a whole could not be proceeded with. The difficulty was this. In the matter of providing that the tenant should become the owner of the soil, the scheme envisaged that by an arrangement, during a particular term of years, the tenant would be enabled to

10·10 a.m.